Perceived Timing of Cutaneous Vibration and Intracortical Microstimulation of Human Somatosensory Cortex

Breanne Christie*[1], Luke E. Osborn[1], David P. McMullen[2], Ambarish S. Pawar[3], Sliman J. Bensmaia[4], Pablo A. Celnik[3], Matthew S. Fifer[1], Francesco V. Tenore[1]

[1]Research and Exploratory Development Department, Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, Laurel, MD, USA

[2] National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA

[3] Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA

[4] Department of Organismal Biology and Anatomy, University of Chicago, Illinois, USA

* Corresponding author, breanne.christie@case.edu, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8397-0859.
Building 201, 11091 Johns Hopkins Road, Fulton, MD 20759

Abstract

Background: Electrically stimulating the somatosensory cortex can partially restore the sense of touch. Though this technique bypasses much of the neuroaxis, prior studies with non-human primates have found that conscious detection of touch elicited by intracortical microstimulation (ICMS) lags behind the detection of vibration applied to the skin. These findings may have been influenced by a mismatch in stimulus intensity; typically, vibration is perceived as more intense than ICMS, which can significantly impact temporal perception.

Objective: The goal of this study was to evaluate the relative latency at which intensity-matched vibration and ICMS are perceived in a human subject.

Methods: A human participant implanted with microelectrode arrays in somatosensory cortex performed a reaction time task and a temporal order judgment (TOJ) task. In the reaction time task, the participant was presented with ICMS or vibration and verbal response times were obtained. In the TOJ task, the participant was sequentially presented with a pair of stimuli – ICMS followed by vibration or vice versa – and reported which stimulus occurred first.

Results: When ICMS and vibration were matched in perceived intensity, the reaction time to vibration was ~50 ms faster than ICMS. However, in the TOJ task, ICMS and vibratory sensations arose at comparable latencies, with points of subjective simultaneity that were not significantly different from zero.

Conclusions: Because the perception of ICMS is slower than that of intensity-matched vibration, it may be necessary to stimulate at stronger ICMS intensities (thus decreasing reaction time) when incorporating ICMS sensory feedback into neural prostheses.

Keywords

Electrical stimulation, brain-computer interface, somatosensation, touch, latency

Introduction

Manual touch plays a critical role in object manipulation and performing activities of daily living [1]. One approach to restoring touch to individuals with somatosensory deficits is electrical activation of neurons in the hand representation of somatosensory cortex [2]–[4]. These artificial tactile signals can be used to support and enhance the use of a prosthetic hand [5]. Precise timing of tactile feedback is critical for enabling rapid dexterous object interactions [6]–[8], which raises a key question as to whether intracortical microstimulation (ICMS) can be perceived and/or integrated with a speed resembling that of natural somatosensation. Indeed, lags in ICMS-evoked percepts could impair the utility of sensory feedback [9], [10].

The reaction time of artificial touch has been studied with cortical surface stimulation through electrocorticographic electrodes in humans [11] and with ICMS in non-human primates (NHPs) [10], [12]. The sensations evoked via stimulation of somatosensory cortex were found to be, under most conditions, slower to emerge than sensations evoked via mechanical stimulation of the skin. This relative slowness is perhaps surprising given that ICMS bypasses multiple stages of peripheral processing. ICMS latencies were able to match peripheral stimulation latencies only when high currents were delivered through at least four electrodes simultaneously in NHPs [10]. This inequivalence in latencies could be explained by mismatched intensities between ICMS and mechanical stimulation; intensity has a demonstrated effect on perceptual latency [13]–[17].

The objective of the present study was to characterize the latency at which ICMS-evoked sensations are consciously experienced, and to compare the latency of artificial touch to its mechanically-evoked and intensity-matched counterpart in humans. To this end, a human participant implanted with microelectrode arrays in somatosensory cortex performed two sensory tasks: (1) a reaction time task, and (2) a temporal order judgment (TOJ) task. In the reaction time task, the participant was presented with an ICMS pulse train or a cutaneous vibration and provided a verbal response. In the TOJ task, the participant was sequentially presented with a pair of stimuli – vibration followed by an ICMS pulse train or vice versa – and judged which of the two occurred first.

Methods

Human participant

The following experiments were conducted with an individual with C5 (sensory), C6 (motor) ASIA B tetraplegia. He had retained intact somatosensation in his fingertips as indicated by clinical reports. This study was conducted under Investigational Device Exemption (IDE, 170010) by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for the purpose of evaluating bilateral sensory and motor capabilities of intracortical microelectrode arrays. The study protocol was approved by the FDA, the Johns Hopkins Institutional Review Board (JH IRB) and the NIWC Human Research Protection Office, and is a registered clinical trial (NCT03161067). The participant gave his written informed consent prior to participation in research-related activities.

Cutaneous vibration of the hand

A vibratory stimulus ("natural touch") was delivered on the hand using a miniature electromechanical tactor (type C-2, Engineering Acoustics, Inc.; Casselberry, FL, USA). The tactor was controlled by sinusoidal signals that were digitally generated in MATLAB (MathWorks, Inc.; Natick, MA, USA). Output signals passed through the computer's audio port and were amplified (Pyle, PTA4 Stereo Power Amplifier). Vibratory inputs were delivered at 300 Hz, which was assumed to primarily activate Pacinian fibers in the skin [18], [19]. The displacement of the tactor could be varied to change the indentation depth into the skin. The tactor was fastened to the hand using medical tape. The participant reported that he could not hear any noise from the tactor so he did not wear noise-cancelling headphones during experiments.

Intracortical microstimulation of somatosensory cortex to elicit tactile percepts in the hand

This study involved a human participant who was chronically implanted with microelectrode arrays in the bilateral primary motor cortices and area 1 of the somatosensory cortices (see Fig 1a, and McMullen et al. and Fifer et al. for additional details on these implants [4], [20]). In the present study, only the stimulating electrodes implanted in somatosensory cortex were used. Two of the arrays were implanted in the left somatosensory cortex and one was in the right hemisphere. To access an external stimulator and software, the arrays were wired to skull-fixed transcutaneous metal pedestals. A CereStim R96 (Blackrock Neurotech, Salt Lake City, UT) was used to deliver electrical stimulation to the electrodes. The electrical stimulation waveforms were biphasic, charge-balanced, cathodic-first pulses and were grounded to the metal

pedestal. Pulse frequency was set to 100 Hz, total pulse width was 500 μs (200 μs for each phase with a 100 μs interphase delay), and pulse amplitude varied between 30-80 μA. Stimulation parameters stayed within safety limits for minimizing the risk of tissue and/or electrode damage [21]. Stimulation pulse trains were controlled via MATLAB scripts that sent commands to a custom C++-based stimulator interface application.

Reaction time task

The participant performed a reaction time test for ICMS pulse trains, vibratory stimuli, and visual stimuli (Figure 1b). The participant was instructed to verbally respond into a microphone when he felt a tactile stimulus or observed the visual stimulus (which served as a control condition). Each stimulus lasted for 500 ms with a random delay of 3-7 s between each trial. Reaction times that fell below 100 ms or above 1000 ms were considered physiologically implausible and excluded from the analysis [22], [23].

Only one stimulus type (ICMS, vibration, or vision) was presented at a time. During the visual reaction time test, the participant viewed a monitor and responded when the screen changed colors. For the ICMS and vibration tests, we tested five different sites across both hands, at two different intensity levels per site (Supplemental Table 1). For each site on the hand, ICMS was delivered through a pair of electrodes that had similar projected fields on the participant's hand. This was done to increase the intensity of ICMS [10], making it easier and more reliable for the participant to perceive. Projected fields were estimated by stimulating through each individual electrode and asking the participant to

verbally report the regions of the hand in which he felt a tactile percept. These electrode mappings are more thoroughly discussed in Fifer et al [4].

Because reaction times are strongly affected by variations in stimulus intensity [13]–[17], [24], we performed perceptual intensity matching between ICMS and vibration on each hand site. Two above-threshold ICMS intensities (one lower, one higher) were chosen for the reaction time task. The lower ICMS amplitude value was generally 1-4.5 dB above the last measured detection threshold for the chosen electrode grouping, typically 30 or 45 μA. The higher ICMS amplitude was always chosen to be 80 μA, which was generally 6-9.4 dB above the last measured detection threshold for the chosen electrode grouping. At a given ICMS intensity, vibration intensity was matched using an adaptive 2-down, 1-up staircase paradigm with a two-alternative forced choice (2-AFC) presentation of ICMS and vibration in which the participant chose which stimulus was perceived as being more intense. If the participant perceived both vibration and ICMS to be of the same magnitude, the adaptive staircase paradigm was stopped.

TOJ task

To evaluate the temporal synchrony of cutaneous vibration and ICMS, we conducted a two-alternative forced choice TOJ task (Figure 1c). In this task, vibration and ICMS were sequentially delivered and the participant was asked which stimulus he perceived as occurring first. The stimuli were separated by a stimulus onset asynchrony (SOA) value of 0, ±50, ±100, ±200, ±300, or ±500 ms. Positive SOA values indicate that ICMS occurred before vibration, and negative values indicate that vibration occurred first. Any

hardware latencies were accounted for such that, if commanded to be delivered simultaneously, the onset of vibration and ICMS were aligned within 1 ms. The start of each trial was indicated by a brief audio cue, and each stimulus lasted for 200 ms. We chose three sites on the hands to apply vibration and subsequently picked stimulating electrodes that elicited ICMS percepts in the same region or spatially offset regions of the hand, depending on the experimental condition (Supplemental Table 1). The order of application of the 11 SOA values was randomized and each SOA was tested 20 times per site. In one instance, in which vibration and ICMS were delivered to the right thumb, we tested each SOA 36 times because the raw experimental data were noisy.

To compare the TOJ results across conditions, we used a parametric bootstrap method with 1000 replications [25]–[27]. This involved generating a synthetic dataset by sampling from a binomial distribution $B(n, p)$, in which n = 20 trials for each SOA, and p = the probability that the participant reported that ICMS came first based on a sigmoidal curve (Equation 1) fit to the raw experimental data. Sigmoidal curves were then fit to each synthetic data set to extract two outcome measures: the point of subjective simultaneity (PSS) and just noticeable difference (JND). The PSS equaled the SOA that corresponded to when the participant reported that he felt ICMS first in 50% of trials. In other words, the PSS represented the temporal offset that resulted in vibration and ICMS being perceived as maximally simultaneous. The JND was equal to the difference in SOA between the 25% and 75% points divided by two.

$$y = \frac{100}{1 + e^{-a(x-b)}}$$ **Equation 1**

Modality discrimination task

To further interpret the reaction time and TOJ results, we performed an additional test to verify that vibratory stimuli and ICMS were clearly perceived and did not interfere with one another. In this test, we delivered either a combination of vibration and ICMS in the same region of the hand ("multiplexed"), vibration alone, ICMS alone, or no stimulus. The participant's task was to report which class(es) of stimulus was presented. If both stimuli were presented, he did not have to specify which came first. Each stimulus lasted 200 ms. To assess interference effects, we varied the SOA during trials when both vibration and ICMS were delivered; the stimuli were simultaneous, vibration preceded ICMS by 200 ms, or ICMS preceded vibration by 200 ms. This temporal offset of 200 ms was selected because it ensured that one stimulus ended before the next began. Each trial began with an auditory cue followed by a one second delay and the stimuli. ICMS amplitude was always 80 μA and the vibration amplitude was matched in perceived intensity using the approach described above. This task was performed at four locations across both hands (Supplemental Table 1), each in different experimental blocks, with 15-30 trials per condition.

Statistical analyses

We performed two-sample two-tailed t-tests to compare the reaction times of vibration vs. ICMS. To compare low- vs. high-intensity stimuli, we ran paired-sample one-tailed t-tests, with the hypothesis that more intense stimuli would be perceived more quickly. To compare tactile stimuli vs. visual stimuli, we ran two-sample one-tailed t-tests, with the hypothesis that visual stimuli would be perceived more quickly.

For the TOJ results, we fit a probability density function to the 1000 bootstrapped PSS values and calculated the proportion of samples that fell above zero, which was assumed to be the one-tailed p-value. A two-tailed test, to evaluate whether the PSS was significantly above or below zero, was performed by doubling the one-tailed p-value. Additionally, to compare the PSS and JND values between the spatially co-located vs. offset conditions, we calculated the proportion of overlap (taken to be the p-value) between the probability density functions of the two conditions.

To statistically analyze the modality discrimination results, we ran proportion tests. To compare the discrimination accuracy against the level of chance, we ran a test of one proportion. The test was one-tailed because we hypothesized that the participant could discriminate between ICMS and vibration at an accuracy above chance. To compare the modality discrimination accuracy between the simultaneous and temporally offset multiplexed conditions, we ran tests of two proportions. The tests were one-tailed because we hypothesized that the participant could discriminate between ICMS and vibration better when the stimuli were temporally offset. Significance levels in all statistical analyses were set to $\alpha=0.05$ and Bonferroni corrections were applied for each task.

Results

Reaction time task

We observed reaction times of 366 ± 106 ms (mean ± standard deviation) for the low-intensity vibrations and 352 ± 111 ms for the high-intensity vibrations (Figure 2 and Supplemental Figure 1). Though the reaction times were faster for the more intense stimuli, as expected, this difference was not statistically significant ($p>0.05$). Reaction times were consistent with previously reported values from studies in which participants responded using a button press, which ranged from 177-400 ms [11], [28], [29], particularly considering that vocal responses tend to be 60-80 ms slower than manual ones [30]. Reaction times to ICMS pulse trains were 456 ± 143 ms for low-intensity stimuli and 400 ± 140 ms for high-intensity stimuli. In contrast to the results with vibratory stimuli, the effect of intensity on ICMS reaction time was statistically significant ($p=0.003$). Importantly, reaction times to ICMS were significantly slower than reaction times to vibration ($p<0.001$ at low intensities, and $p=0.01$ at high intensities).

To further benchmark the participant's reaction times with respect to those of able-bodied individuals, we measured his reaction times to visual stimuli. We found that the mean reaction time of 295 ± 75 ms was comparable to previously measured values (around 330 ms [30]). As in previous studies, reaction times to visual stimuli were faster than for tactile stimuli ($p<0.001$ at either intensity level for either tactile stimulus) [28].

TOJ task

When vibration and ICMS were spatially offset, the PSS was -12 ± 25 ms for one pair of stimulus locations (vibration on right ring, ICMS on right thumb), -57 ± 29 ms for another (right thumb, right ring), and -50 ± 26 ms for a third (left thumb, left index) (Figure 3a and Supplemental Figure 2). The negative values indicate that vibration needed to occur before ICMS for the two stimuli to be perceived as simultaneous. While the PSSs were systematically less 0, none were significantly so after Bonferroni corrections were applied, meaning that ICMS and vibration were perceived as maximally simultaneous when presented at exactly the same time.

When ICMS and vibration were co-located, PSSs were -54 ± 24 ms for the right ring finger, +50 ± 34 ms for the right thumb, and +13 ± 34 ms for the left thumb (Figure 3b). Again, PSSs were not significantly different from zero after Bonferroni correction. The PSS values in the spatially offset vs. co-located conditions were also not significantly different ($p > 0.05$).

Finally, the JNDs suggested that the participant was sensitive to changes in timing over a time scale of hundreds of milliseconds. When vibration and ICMS were spatially offset, JNDs were 155 ± 25 ms, 176 ± 28 ms, and 152 ± 27 ms for the three conditions. When vibration and ICMS were co-located, the JNDs were 133 ± 23 ms, 230 ± 40 ms, and 216 ± 37 ms. The JND values in the spatially offset vs. co-located conditions were not significantly different ($p > 0.05$).

Modality discrimination task

The participant was able to reliably identify the stimulus modalities delivered across the four sites tested (Figure 4 and Supplemental Figure 3). “Vibration only” conditions were classified correctly 86% of the time and “ICMS only” conditions were correctly classified 93% of the time (chance = 25%). When both stimuli were presented simultaneously (the “multiplexed” condition in Figure 4), the participant’s accuracy dropped to 69% correct, but was still significantly higher than chance ($p<0.001$). When the participant misclassified trials containing both stimuli, he was most likely (90%) to report only perceiving vibration, despite stimulus levels being matched in perceived intensity. When the stimuli were temporally offset by 200 ms, his classification accuracy significantly improved to 83% when vibration preceded ICMS ($p=0.011$) and 91% correct when ICMS preceded vibration ($p<0.001$).

Discussion

The goal of this study was to evaluate the relative latency at which intensity-matched artificial and natural touch sensations are perceived. To this end, we conducted reaction time tests and TOJ tests with a human participant implanted with stimulating microelectrodes in his somatosensory cortex [4], [20]. Consistent with previous studies [10]–[12], we found that the reaction time to vibratory stimuli was 48-90 ms faster than artificial tactile percepts elicited by cortical stimulation, even when the two stimuli were matched in perceived intensity. However, in the TOJ task, vibratory and ICMS sensations

seemed to arise at comparable latencies, with estimated PSS values which were not significantly different from zero.

Vibration is perceived more quickly than ICMS

In this study, we found that the reaction time to vibration was faster than that of ICMS, and both tactile stimuli were perceived slower than visual stimuli. This result refuted our original prediction that the reaction time to artificial touch would be faster than vibration if the stimuli were intensity matched, but is consistent with previous findings [10]–[12]. Though equating intensity is not sufficient to equate the reaction times of vibration and ICMS, stimulating through at least four electrodes in somatosensory cortex is [10]. Similarly, we found that the reaction time decreased as stimulus intensity increased for both vibration and ICMS. There were also differences in ICMS reaction times across hand sites, again consistent with prior studies [10] and expected because we did not intensity-match ICMS across sites.

Delayed perception of ICMS may be due to the fact that ICMS activates excitatory and inhibitory somatosensory cortex neurons in nondiscriminatory and therefore unnatural combinations [12]. This was supported by our participant's subjective verbal descriptions of artificial tactile stimuli – ICMS was often described as "pressure" or "tingling," but he reported that it felt different than normal pressure and different than vibration. When future technology enables us to selectively activate specific neurons in somatosensory cortex, likely creating more natural-feeling percepts, it would be interesting to repeat these tests.

Overlapping vibration and ICMS can be simultaneously perceived

To our knowledge, this is the first study that evaluated the perception of vibration and ICMS delivered such that they simultaneously activated the same population of cortical neurons (by delivering vibration at the location of the projected field of ICMS). The modality discrimination test results demonstrate that when vibration and ICMS were intensity-matched, one stimulus did not overwhelm the other. However, though the participant performed well above chance (25%), the trials in which both vibration and ICMS were presented at the same time were the most challenging (accuracy = 69%), ostensibly due to the fact that ICMS and vibration engaged overlapping circuitry in somatosensory cortex. Additionally, when the participant did misclassify stimuli in the simultaneous multiplexed condition, he reported feeling vibration only, suggesting that even though the stimulation modalities were intensity matched, vibration may still overwhelm perception of the more artificial ICMS. Finally, once the temporal offset was introduced, the participant's classification accuracy significantly improved.

Disparity between reaction time and TOJ results

In contrast to the reaction time results, results from the TOJ task suggested that mechanically- and electrically-evoked sensations emerge with approximately the same latency. The participant's difficulty discriminating between stimulus modalities may have hindered his performance on the TOJ task. Again, this confusion likely stems from the fact that the two stimuli engage overlapping neural circuitry in somatosensory cortex.

Note, however, that discrepancies between reaction time and TOJ tasks have been previously observed [31][32] and may reflect differences in task demands. Specifically, reaction time judgments are speeded whereas TOJ judgments are not. Accordingly, the nervous system may have time to resolve minor differences in sensory latency by the time the participant has to make a TOJ judgment. Another possibility is that the participant was biased towards reporting ICMS first because the evoked tactile percept did not feel natural, which required greater concentration to detect and interpret. This type of selective attentional bias can reduce detection time in a TOJ task [33]–[35].

Limitations

Although we used previously validated experimental techniques, this study had a number of limitations. Our findings could become more generalizable if they were repeated in a larger sample size. Additionally, because of the participant's spinal cord injury, it is possible that he had sensory deficits in his hands that could not be detected via clinical reports, which could have impacted the detectability of vibratory stimuli. Finally, though we matched the intensity between vibration and ICMS pairings, we did not match the intensities *across* pairings, which likely accounts for some of the cross-site variation (Supplemental Figures).

Implications for brain-computer interfaces

Somatosensory feedback improves performance on dexterous motor tasks [36], [37] while minimizing reliance on visual feedback [38]. Touch feedback provided via ICMS has recently been demonstrated to improve reach-to-grasp task completion times for a

person with spinal cord injury [5]. Despite our observation that the perception of ICMS is slower than vibration, prior studies have demonstrated that ICMS perception can be accelerated by increasing stimulating current across at least four electrodes [10]. Future studies should be performed to evaluate whether high-intensity ICMS is comfortable and functionally beneficial over long periods of time in sensorimotor tasks, simulating the use case of brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) outside of a laboratory. Additionally, the nervous system maintains multisensory synchrony by correcting for short time lags [39]. Even though the reaction time to mechanical tactile stimulation is slower than vision, these differences are compensated for, so the short delays observed in this study may not be problematic.

As one of the first studies in humans with simultaneous and overlapping touch stimuli delivered peripherally and to the brain, this study also has an impact beyond the scope of sensorimotor rehabilitation. A more precise understanding of how brain stimulation and natural touch interact will be critical for designing sensorimotor BCIs for able-bodied users in augmented reality or gaming applications [40], [41].

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no financial or otherwise competing interests.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Brock Wester, Manuel Anaya, and the research participant. This work was made possible, in part, through financial support from Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) under the Neurally Enhanced Operations program (contract number HR001120C0120) and the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory. In addition, this work was supported with the resources and use of facilities at the Johns Hopkins Hospital.

Disclaimer

The views, opinions and/or findings expressed are those of the author and should not be interpreted as representing the official views or policies of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.

Figures

Figure 1: Experimental methods. **(a)** This study involved a human participant with a brain-computer interface. This consisted of two microelectrode arrays in the left hemisphere somatosensory cortex, one array in the right somatosensory cortex, two arrays in the left motor cortex, and one array in the right motor cortex. **(b)** We conducted three versions of a simple reaction time task. During the visual reaction time task, the participant verbally responded into a microphone when he observed a computer screen turning from white to green. During the natural touch reaction time test, the participant verbally responded when he felt a vibratory stimulus on his skin. During the artificial touch reaction time test, the participant verbally responded when he felt tactile percepts elicited by intracortical microstimulation (ICMS). ICMS was delivered via a microelectrode array implanted in the somatosensory cortex. **c)** In the temporal order judgement task, ICMS and vibration were sequentially presented and the participant was asked to respond which stimulus he perceived as occurring first. The stimuli were separated by a stimulus onset asynchrony value between 0-500 ms. We conducted two versions of this task: one in which ICMS and vibration were delivered to the same region of his hand, and one in which ICMS and vibration were spatially offset.



Figure 2: Reaction time test results for vibratory stimuli, intracortical microstimulation (ICMS), and visual stimuli. Each point on the graph represents one trial and the asterisks indicate statistically significant differences. “Low” and “high” represent the two intensity levels tested for both vibration and ICMS (both levels being higher than threshold amplitudes). The vibration and ICMS results are collapsed across the five different test sites.



Figure 3: Temporal order judgement task results. Positive stimulus onset asynchrony values indicate that intracortical microstimulation (ICMS) occurred before vibration, and negative values indicate that vibration ('Vibr') occurred first. Sigmoidal curves were fit to the raw data and a bootstrap analysis was performed to get the error bars for each curve. In the bottom row, the image of tactor indicates where vibration was delivered and an opaque oval indicates where ICMS was delivered. For all conditions, the point of subjective simultaneity (corresponding to a 50% "ICMS first" reporting percentage) was not significantly different from 0 ms. **(a)** Vibration and ICMS were delivered to different regions of the same hand. Solid red line: vibration of right ring finger, ICMS of right thumb. Dashed black line: vibration of right thumb, ICMS of right ring. Dashed-dotted blue line: vibration of left thumb, ICMS of left index finger. **(b)** Vibration and ICMS were delivered to overlapping regions of the hand. Solid red line: vibration and ICMS were both delivered to the right ring finger. Dashed black line: vibration and ICMS were both delivered to the right thumb. Dashed-dotted blue line: vibration and ICMS were both delivered to the left thumb.



Figure 4: Modality discrimination task results, collapsed across the four different sites on the hand. During the "multiplexed" condition, both vibratory stimuli and ICMS were delivered. A negative temporal offset during the multiplexed condition signifies that vibration preceded ICMS and a positive offset indicates that ICMS preceded vibration. The participant was able to correctly identify trials with only vibration and only ICMS 86% and 93% of the time, respectively. The participant's ability to accurately identify both stimuli modalities was lower compared to identifying a single stimulus modality, with an accuracy of 69%. When vibration and ICMS were temporally offset by 200 ms, the participant's classification accuracy significantly improved to 83% when vibration preceded ICMS (p=0.011) and 91% correct when ICMS preceded vibration (p<0.001).



Supplemental Figure 1: **(a-e)** Reaction time results for each site and perceived intensity level ("Low" and "High") tested across both hands. In general, the participant's reaction time to intracortical microstimulation (ICMS) was slower than his reaction to vibration at the same level of perceived intensity; however, this difference was more likely to be statistically significant at the lowest intensity level. Each point on the subplots represents one trial and the asterisks indicate statistically significant differences. **(f)** Vibration and ICMS levels used for each of the hand sites. Perceived intensity levels ("Low" and "High") were matched between ICMS and vibration, but not across hand sites. Stimulation decibel levels are relative to previously estimated detection thresholds for that particular stimulation site.



(f)

Location	Stimulation Level: ICMS dB (μA) Low	ICMS High	Vibration dB Low	Vibration High
R. Thumb	2.0 (30)	6.2 (80)	2.0	7.0
R. Ring	3.3 (30)	7.5 (80)	4.7	6.5
R. Index	5.1 (30)	9.4 (80)	-3.9†	5.1
R. Middle	1.1 (45)	3.6 (80)	1.1	1.9
L. Thumb	4.5 (45)	7.0 (80)	2.1	8.5

†stimulation amplitude below previously estimated detection threshold

Supplemental Figure 2: Temporal order judgement task raw data plus fitted curves using Equation 1. Positive stimulus onset asynchrony (SOA) values indicate that intracortical microstimulation (ICMS) occurred before vibration, and negative values indicate that vibration ('Vibr') occurred first. Each data point represents a percentage of 20 trials (except for the condition in which vibration and ICMS were both delivered to the right thumb, which involved 36 trials per SOA). Sigmoidal curves were fit to the raw data and goodness-of-fit R^2 values are included on each plot. In the top row of plots, vibration and ICMS were delivered to overlapping regions of the hand. In the bottom row, vibration and ICMS were delivered to spatially offset regions of the hand. RR: right ring finger, RT: right thumb, LT: left thumb, LI: left index finger.



Supplemental Figure 3: Modality discrimination task results across four different sites on the hand: **(A)** the left thumb, **(B)** right thumb, **(C)** base of the right middle finger, and **(D)** the right index finger. During the "multiplexed" condition, both vibration and ICMS were delivered. A negative temporal offset during the multiplexed condition signifies that vibration preceded ICMS and a positive offset indicates that ICMS preceded vibration. In all cases, the participant was able to correctly identify trials with only ICMS and only vibration at least 87% and 80% of the time, respectively. In general, the participant's ability to accurately identify both stimuli modalities was lower compared to identifying a single stimulus modality, but performance ranged from as low as 40% (for simultaneous vibration and ICMS on the right index finger) up to 100% for trials in which ICMS preceded vibration on the (A) left thumb and (D) right index finger.



Supplemental Table 1: The experimental conditions for all three tasks. The reaction time task and some conditions of the modality discrimination task presented only one stimulus per trial, therefore we wrote "N/A" in the "Stimulus B" column. I_{high} and I_{low} signify that the test was performed once with a high-intensity stimulus and once with a low-intensity stimulus.

Experimental task	Stimulus A	Stimulus B
Reaction time	Vibration of right thumb (I_{high} and I_{low})	N/A
	Vibration of right ring finger (I_{high} and I_{low})	
	Vibration of right index finger (I_{high} and I_{low})	
	Vibration of right middle finger (I_{high} and I_{low})	
	Vibration of left thumb (I_{high} and I_{low})	
	ICMS of right thumb (I_{high} and I_{low})	
	ICMS of right ring finger (I_{high} and I_{low})	
	ICMS of right index finger (I_{high} and I_{low})	
	ICMS of right middle finger (I_{high} and I_{low})	
	ICMS of left thumb (I_{high} and I_{low})	
Temporal order judgement	Vibration of right ring finger	ICMS of right ring finger
	Vibration of right ring finger	ICMS of right thumb
	Vibration of right thumb	ICMS of right thumb
	Vibration of right thumb	ICMS of right ring finger
	Vibration of left thumb	ICMS of left thumb
	Vibration of left thumb	ICMS of left index finger
Modality discrimination	Vibration of left thumb	N/A
	Vibration of right thumb	
	Vibration of right middle finger	
	Vibration of right index finger	
	Vibration of left thumb	ICMS of left thumb
	Vibration of right thumb	ICMS of right thumb
	Vibration of right middle finger	ICMS of right middle finger
	Vibration of right index finger	ICMS of right index finger
	ICMS of left thumb	N/A
	ICMS of right thumb	
	ICMS of right middle finger	
	ICMS of right index finger	
	None (control condition)	

References

[1] R. S. Johansson and J. R. Flanagan, “Coding and use of tactile signals from the fingertips in object manipulation tasks,” *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 345–359, May 2009, doi: 10.1038/nrn2621.

[2] S. N. Flesher *et al.*, “Intracortical microstimulation of human somatosensory cortex,” *Science Translational Medicne*, pp. 1–11, 2016, doi: 10.1126/scitranslmed.aaf8083.

[3] M. A. Salas *et al.*, “Proprioceptive and cutaneous sensations in humans elicited by intracortical microstimulation,” *eLife*, 2018, doi: 10.7554/eLife.32904.

[4] M. S. Fifer *et al.*, “Intracortical Somatosensory Stimulation to Elicit Fingertip Sensations in an Individual With Spinal Cord Injury,” *Neurology*, p. 10.1212/WNL.0000000000013173, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1212/WNL.0000000000013173.

[5] S. N. Flesher *et al.*, “A brain-computer interface that evokes tactile sensations improves robotic arm control,” *Science*, vol. 372, no. 6544, pp. 831–836, May 2021, doi: 10.1126/science.abd0380.

[6] W. Goebl and C. Palmer, “Tactile feedback and timing accuracy in piano performance,” *Experimental Brain Research*, vol. 186, no. 3, pp. 471–479, Apr. 2008, doi: 10.1007/S00221-007-1252-1/FIGURES/5.

[7] E. Rohde Marieke and Di Paolo, “Adaptation to Sensory Delays,” in *Advances in Artificial Life*, 2007, pp. 193–202.

[8] R. A. Chase, I. Rapin, L. Gilden, S. Sutton, and G. Guilfoyle, “II Sensory feedback influences on keytapping motor tasks,” *http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17470216108416488*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 153–167, Sep. 2008, doi: 10.1080/17470216108416488.

[9] S. Shimada, K. Fukuda, and K. Hiraki, “Rubber Hand Illusion under Delayed Visual Feedback,” *PLOS ONE*, vol. 4, no. 7, p. e6185, Jul. 2009, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0006185.

[10] J. T. Sombeck and L. E. Miller, “Short reaction times in response to multi-electrode intracortical microstimulation may provide a basis for rapid movement-related feedback,” 2020. doi: 10.1088/1741-2552/ab5cf3.

[11] D. J. Caldwell *et al.*, “Direct stimulation of somatosensory cortex results in slower reaction times compared to peripheral touch in humans,” *Scientific Reports*, 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-38619-2.

[12] J. M. Godlove, E. O. Whaite, and A. P. Batista, “Comparing temporal aspects of visual, tactile, and microstimulation feedback for motor control,” *Journal of Neural Engineering*, 2014, doi: 10.1088/1741-2560/11/4/046025.

[13] P. Jaśkowski, “Chapter 11 Reaction time and temporal-order judgment as measures of perceptual latency: The problem of dissociations,” in *Advances in Psychology*, vol. 129, G. Aschersleben, T. Bachmann, and J. Müsseler, Eds. North-Holland, 1999, pp. 265–282. doi: 10.1016/S0166-4115(99)80026-0.

[14] O. Neumann and M. Niepel, “Timing of ‘Perception’ and Perception of ‘Time,’” in *Psychophysics Beyond Sensation: Laws and Invariants of Human Cognition*, C. Kaernbach, E. Schroger, and H. Müller, Eds. Psychology Press, 2004, pp. 245–269. Accessed: Dec. 08, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Mo9i5_yidGIC&oi=fnd&pg=PR3&dq=%22Psychophysics+Beyond+Sensation:+Laws+and+Invariants+of+Human+Cognition%22&ots=WG5vhIypBD&sig=wtcLMfHL0XIxPr4tON5UJuJoDAo#v=onepage&q=%22Psychophysics%20Beyond%20Sensation%3A%20Laws%20and%20Invariants%20of%20Human%20Cognition%22&f=false

[15] A. J. Sanford, “Effects of Changes in the Intensity of White Noise on Simultaneity Judgements and Simple Reaction Time,” *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 296–303, Aug. 1971, doi: 10.1080/14640746908401824.

[16] D. I. Shore and C. Spence, “Prior Entry,” in *Neurobiology of Attention*, Elsevier, 2005, pp. 89–95. doi: 10.1016/B978-012375731-9/50019-7.

[17] W. F. Smith, “The relative quickness of visual and auditory perception,” *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 239–257, Apr. 1933, Accessed: Mar. 19, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://insights.ovid.com/experimental-psychology/joexps/1933/04/000/relative-quickness-visual-auditory-perception/4/00004782

[18] V. E. Abraira and D. D. Ginty, “The sensory neurons of touch,” *Neuron*. 2013. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2013.07.051.

[19] F. McGlone and D. Reilly, “The cutaneous sensory system,” *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2010. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2009.08.004.

[20] D. P. McMullen *et al.*, “Novel intraoperative online functional mapping of somatosensory finger representations for targeted stimulating electrode placement: technical note,” *Journal of Neurosurgery*, vol. 1, no. aop, pp. 1–8, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.3171/2020.9.JNS202675.

[21] A. T. Rajan *et al.*, “The effects of chronic intracortical microstimulation on neural tissue and fine motor behavior,” *Journal of Neural Engineering*, 2015, doi: 10.1088/1741-2560/12/6/066018.

[22] J. Miller, V. Franz, and R. Ulrich, “Effects of auditory stimulus intensity on response force in simple, go/no-go, and choice RT tasks,” *Perception and Psychophysics*, 1999, doi: 10.3758/BF03211952.

[23] D. Włodarczyk, P. Jaśkowski, and A. Nowik, “Influence of sleep deprivation and auditory intensity on reaction time and response force,” *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 2002, doi: 10.2466/pms.2002.94.3c.1101.

[24] P. Jaskowski and R. Verleger, “Attentional Bias toward Low-Intensity Stimuli: An Explanation for the Intensity Dissociation between Reaction Time and Temporal Order Judgment?,” *Consciousness and Cognition*, 2000, doi: 10.1006/ccog.2000.0461.

[25] E. Azañón and S. Soto-Faraco, “Alleviating the ‘crossed-hands’ deficit by seeing uncrossed rubber hands,” *Experimental Brain Research*, 2007, doi: 10.1007/s00221-007-1011-3.

[26] B. Efron and R. J. Tibshirani, *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. 1993. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4899-4541-9.

[27] R. Kanai, B. R. Sheth, and S. Shimojo, “Stopping the motion and sleuthing the flash-lag effect: Spatial uncertainty is the key to perceptual mislocalization,” *Vision Research*, 2004, doi: 10.1016/j.visres.2003.10.028.

[28] A. Diederich and H. Colonius, “Bimodal and trimodal multisensory enhancement: Effects of stimulus onset and intensity on reaction time,” *Perception and Psychophysics*, 2004, doi: 10.3758/BF03195006.

[29] P. P. Lele, D. C. Sinclair, and G. Weddell, “The reaction time to touch,” *The Journal of Physiology*, 1954, doi: 10.1113/jphysiol.1954.sp005042.

[30] R. D. Nebes, “Vocal versus manual response as a determinant of age difference in simple reaction time,” *Journals of Gerontology*, 1978, doi: 10.1093/geronj/33.6.884.

[31] J. Miller and W. Schwarz, “Dissociations between reaction times and temporal order judgments: A diffusion model approach,” *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 2006, doi: 10.1037/0096-1523.32.2.394.

[32] J. Rutschmann and R. Link, “Perception of temporal order of stimuli differing in sense mode and simple reaction time,” *Perceptual and motor skills*, 1964, doi: 10.2466/pms.1964.18.2.345.

[33] I. Scharlau and O. Neumann, “Perceptual latency priming by masked and unmasked stimuli: Evidence for an attentional interpretation,” *Psychological Research*. 2003. doi: 10.1007/s00426-002-0116-3.

[34] L. B. Stelmach and C. M. Herdman, “Directed Attention and Perception of Temporal Order,” *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 1991, doi: 10.1037/0096-1523.17.2.539.

[35] S. Sternberg and R. L. Knoll, “The perception of temporal order: fundamental issues and a general model,” *Attention and Performance*, vol. IV, pp. 629–685, 1973, Accessed: Dec. 08, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.441.5605&rep=rep1&type=pdf

[36] R. S. Johansson and J. R. Flanagan, “Coding and use of tactile signals from the fingertips in object manipulation tasks,” *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*. 2009. doi: 10.1038/nrn2621.

[37] J. Monzée, Y. Lamarre, and A. M. Smith, “The effects of digital anesthesia on force control using a precision grip,” *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 2003, doi: 10.1152/jn.00434.2001.

[38] C. Ghez, J. Gordon, and M. F. Ghilardi, “Impairments of reaching movements in patients without proprioception. II. Effects of visual information on accuracy,” *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 1995, doi: 10.1152/jn.1995.73.1.361.

[39] M. Keetels and J. Vroomen, “Perception of Synchrony between the Senses,” in *The Neural Bases of Multisensory Processes*, M. M. Murray and M. T. Wallace, Eds. Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press/Taylor & Francis, 2012. Accessed: Apr. 20, 2017. [Online]. Available: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK92837/

[40] N. Grossman *et al.*, “Noninvasive Deep Brain Stimulation via Temporally Interfering Electric Fields,” *Cell*, vol. 169, no. 6, pp. 1029-1041.e16, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.1016/J.CELL.2017.05.024.

[41] W. Lee, H. Kim, Y. Jung, I. U. Song, Y. A. Chung, and S. S. Yoo, “Image-Guided Transcranial Focused Ultrasound Stimulates Human Primary Somatosensory Cortex,” *Scientific Reports 2015 5:1*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–10, Mar. 2015, doi: 10.1038/srep08743.